

FW This is on the EPA website.txt

From: Vakoc, Misha
Sent: Wednesday, November 20, 2019 4:16 AM
To: Molloy, Jennifer
Subject: FW: This is on the EPA website

I believe Ms. Lett is already on your list (but she's also got many cc:'s)

From: Barbara Lett (b) (6)
Sent: Monday, November 18, 2019 5:59 PM
To: Vakoc, Misha <Vakoc.Misha@epa.gov>; christopher.larsen@mail.house.gov;
Jennifer@wclt.org;
"'jessica@wclt.org.'"@domain.invalid; erin@wclt.org; '(b) (6) '
(b) (6) ; (b) (6)
(b) (6)
(b) (6)

Cc: (b) (6)
Subject: This is on the EPA website

<https://www.epa.gov/environmental-topics>

<https://www.epa.gov/environmental-topics/water-topics>

<https://www.epa.gov/nep>

<https://www.epa.gov/wetlands/coastal-wetlands>

<https://www.epa.gov/wetlands/forms/contact-us-about-wetlands>

From: [Barbara Lett](#)
To: [Vakoc, Misha](#); christopher.larsen@mail.house.gov; Jennifer@wclt.org; [@domain.invalid](mailto:jessica@wclt.org); erin@wclt.org; (b) (6);
Cc: (b) (6); (b) (6)
Subject: FW: [DCI Info] Fwd: Navy's Permit to Pollute Questioned
Date: Monday, November 18, 2019 5:23:12 PM
Attachments: [Untitled attachment 00004.txt](#)

Don't know if you received this, so FYI...I am shocked and very disappointed...

If you browse environmental topics (ie. Water, etc.) on this EPA website, You will be even more disappointed and confused...

<https://www.epa.gov/>

I echo: REALLY???

Barbara

From: info-bounces@duguallabay.org [mailto:info-bounces@duguallabay.org] **On Behalf Of** Susan Schopf
Sent: Monday, November 18, 2019 4:36 PM
To: info@duguallabay.org
Subject: [DCI Info] Fwd: Navy's Permit to Pollute Questioned

Not surprised but very disappointed. Please see email address below for response to EPA.

Thank you, Susan Schopf

Begin forwarded message:

From: Richard Abraham <>
Subject: Navy's Permit to Pollute Questioned
Date: November 18, 2019 at 12:30:25 PM PST

The Navy's Permit to Pollute

The EPA shut down the public comment period on November 14 and granted a permit to Whidbey Naval Air Station that ignores its pollution of public waters. The Navy would not support the request for the extension.

Citizens requested an extension of the comment period on the proposed stormwater permit because the Navy withheld test results showing toxic PFAS chemicals in the water—and hasn't released results that might reveal other pollutants.

PFASs (poly/perfluoroalkyl substances) are harmful to humans, persist in the environment, and accumulate in fish and marine mammals. The Navy discharges PFASs to Clover Valley Creek, a Lake, a salmon restoration area, and Dugualla Bay.

EPA admits to being unaware of the PFASs when it wrote the permit. Neither did it know these 'forever' chemicals had turned up in nearby drinking water wells. It granted the permit anyway.

A year ago the Navy revealed that two PFASs were found in the water. It didn't reveal that six had

actually been found—and in twelve monthly tests since then. The Navy waited nine months, well into the comment period, to tell a family that PFASs were in their well.

EPA says it “might” revisit the permit. Really? EPA shouldn’t be rubber-stamping permits that ignore discharges of toxic chemicals. It should rewrite the permit with protective provisions and a set new public comment period.

If you agree, send an email to EPA saying so Misha Vakoc vakoc.misha@epa.gov.

Rick Abraham